REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-19 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 16 are amended. Claim 12 is cancelled. Claims 20-22 are added. Support for the amendment to claim 1 and added claim 20 can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph 6. Support for the amendments to claim 16 can be found in the specification as originally filed at paragraphs 29, and 30. Support for added claims 21 and 22 can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph 16. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The abstract stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have replaced the abstract according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 12, 16, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Li is generally directed toward a method and apparatus for voice annotation and retrieval of multimedia data. In particular, the Examiner relies on Li et al. to teach a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching said at least one tag to a plurality of individuals for review. However, the section of Li et al. cited by the Examiner (column 4, lines 15-20) merely teaches post annotation in which a speaker or narrator reviews

media content during playback and annotates it with speech using a formal descriptive language. Perhaps the Examiner considers the tag dispatched for review when the annotated media is released to the public for consumption. However, Li et al. does not teach a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching tags to a plurality of individuals for review based on tag source, with one tag provided via one input having a label identifying a source of the tag respective of another source providing another tag via another input, and the other tag, which is also assigned to the media, has another label identifying the other source.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a collaborative media indexing system and method. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed toward a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching tags to a plurality of individuals for review based on tag source, with one tag provided via one input having a label identifying a source of the tag respective of another source providing another tag via another input, and the other tag also annotating the media and having another label identifying the other source. For example, independent claim 1, as amended, recites, "a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching said at least one tag to a plurality of individuals for review based on tag source, wherein said at least one tag includes a label identifying a source of said at least one tag respective of another source providing another tag via another input, wherein the other tag is also assigned to the media, said other tag having another label identifying the other source." Therefore, Li et al. does not teach all of the limitations of independent claim 1, especially as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), along with rejection of all claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 16

Li is generally directed toward a method and apparatus for voice annotation and retrieval of multimedia data. In particular, the Examiner relies on Li et al. to teach a tag analysis system comparing information from one or more inputs to determine and correct inconsistencies therein in the form of a lattice engine that builds a probability lattice from annotations tagging media. However, Li et al. does not teach a tag analysis system that determines and corrects inconsistent tags assigned to a segment of media by comparing inconsistent tags from different sources employing different inputs to supply their respective tags.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a collaborative media indexing system and method. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed toward a tag analysis system that determines and corrects inconsistent tags assigned to a segment of media by comparing inconsistent tags from different sources employing different inputs to supply their respective tags. For example, independent claim 16, as amended, recites, "said tag analysis system is adapted to determine and correct inconsistent tags assigned to a segment of media by comparing inconsistent tags from different sources employing different inputs to supply their respective tags." Therefore, Li et al. does not teach all of the limitations of independent claim 16, especially as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), along with rejection of all claims dependent therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-6, 11, 14-15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Bennett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,884,256). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Bennet et al. does not teach all of the elements recited in independent claims 1 and 16, nor does the Examiner rely on Bennet et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6, 11, 14-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on their dependence from allowable base claims.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Ebert (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0144985). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Ebert does not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Ebert in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Jain et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,444). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Jain et al. does not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Jain et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Moreover, Applicants note that claim 10 is dependent from claim 9, and that Jain et al. does not teach generating an attribute using a sensor. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 is improperly based on Li et al. and Jain et al. alone, especially where the Examiner relies upon Ebert teach elements of claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Srivastava et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,549,922). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Srivastava et al. does not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Jain et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Liu et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0105589). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Liu et al. does not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 16, nor does the Examiner rely on Liu et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _October 28, 2005_   By: _____

Jennifer S. Brooks
Reg. No. 51,501

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/JSB/kp]